

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**APRIL 3, 1997**

PROJECT REVIEWED

Convened: 8:00 AM

Holly Park  
Boyer Fuhrman Street Reconstruction  
Magnolia Pool

DISCUSSION

Design Review Evaluation

CITY UPDATES

Seattle Public Utilities Department

Adjourned: 3:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Barbara Swift, Chair  
Moe Batra  
Carolyn Darwish  
Gail Dubrow  
Robert Foley  
Gerald Hansmire  
Jon Layzer  
Rick Sundberg

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner  
Michael Read

---

040397.1      Project: **HOLLY PARK REDEVELOPMENT**  
Phase: Project Update and Report on Conclusion of Combined Design  
Commission / Design Review Panel  
Presenters: Stephen Antupit, Office of Management & Planning  
Ed Weinstein, Weinstein Copeland Architects  
Barbara Swift, Swift & Company  
David Rutherford, ARC Architects  
Dennis Haskell, Chair, Combined Design Commission / Design  
Review Panel  
Vince Lyons, Department of Construction & Land Use  
Henry Popkin, Popkin Development  
Doris Koo, Seattle Housing Authority  
Attendees: Maria Gonzalez, Seattle Planning Commission  
Chuck Weinstock, Seattle Planning Commission  
Marty Curry, Seattle Planning Commission  
Nancy Ousley, Office of Management & Planning  
Theresa Cherniak, Office of Management & Planning  
Richard Richmire, Office of Management & Planning  
Beverley Barnett, Seattle Transportation  
Marilyn Senour, Seattle Transportation  
Joe Taskey, Seattle Transportation  
Michael Brown, City Council Staff  
Geri Hendrickson, City Council Staff  
Michael Mann, City Council Staff  
Darlene Walser, Seattle Housing Authority  
John Fox, Seattle Displacement Coalition  
John Phillips, Phillips McCullough  
Ed Rose, EM Rose & Associates, Inc.  
Tom Eames, Weinstein Copeland  
Randy Everett, Weinstein Copeland  
Mark Erichetti, SvR Design  
Maiti Arramosa, Popkin Development  
Ron Lewis, Parsons Brinkerhoff  
Time: 2 hour (N/C)

#### Project Overview

Stephen Antupit

Partnerships and building community are the two guiding themes of the Holly Park Redevelopment Project. From the beginning of the planning process three years ago, a wide array of community groups, social service providers, economic development interests have joined with residents of Holly Park, the Seattle Housing Authority and, most recently, the design team to develop the current proposal. The combined Southeast Seattle Design Review Board/Seattle

Design Commission review panel process has been completed, and has been an important component of the project to date.

#### Master Plan

Ed Weinstein

The 102 acre site of Holly Park is differentiated by a pronounced topography. Three principal areas of the site are primarily defined by the land form: Upper Holly is the area west of the power line and north of Myrtle Street, Middle Holly lies east of the power line and descends down towards 37th fronting on ML King Jr. Way, and Lower Holly sits south of Othello Street and east of ML King Jr. Way. The redevelopment has been divided into three phases. The first phase of redevelopment will occur in the area west of the power lines, south of Morgan Street and north of Van Asselt park. In terms of the physical development, there will be more dramatic changes in the first phase of redevelopment than in the second and third phases due primarily to antiquated infrastructure that must be replaced to achieve the redevelopment objectives. Phases 2 and 3 will respond to existing roadway and utility networks, and construction benches. The project has been attentive to the impacts of the future RTA station to be constructed at ML King Jr. Way and Othello Street. Phases 2 and 3 will be planned over the next few years for which pre-liminary thoughts may be modified by circumstances as they unfold.

The following planning principles for phase 1 were developed and put in place by the Holly Park Board of Governors, the residents council, the combined design review panel, community involvement through the EIS process and other open houses adopted by consensus:

1. Slightly increased density.
2. Create a mixed income neighborhood.
3. Affordable, market rate and low income housing units should be indistinguishable, i.e. built to the same level of quality in material and appearance.
4. The street network that surrounds the site should be extended onto the site to as much as possible in order to help break down the physical distinction of Holly Park from the surrounding community.
5. Increase public safety through a more predictable street grid that is more easily monitored by residents and police.
6. Create defensible spaces around the units through a hierarchy of open spaces from the street to the yard.
7. Bring cars into proximity of the units instead of leaving them in large lots.
8. Maintain and promote the existing topography and landscape as much as possible.
9. Provide accessible residential units and locate them as evenly as possible around the site.
10. Increase the number and size of bedrooms.
11. Pursue semi detached houses as opposed to long runs of townhouses.

Cost effective housing at \$50/sq. ft., and a high quality of design that does not look like typical public housing have been the driving objectives to the site plan and design. In order to provide a diversity of building types, a kit of parts approach has been undertaken. The three bedroom, attached duplex is the predominant building type and has been used as the building block unit in

the site planning. While the skin and roof forms of individual units will look different, the essential construction is repetitive and very rational. Maintaining existing trees will have a dramatic affect on the neighborhood, by lending an immediate, established permanence.

#### Landscape

Barbara Swift

Evaluating the existing infrastructure of open space and activity given the recreational, economic development and open space needs of the Holly Park population was the first step in the landscape design. Based on the evaluation, a comprehensive open space system was developed. The principles that have guided the landscape design are:

1. Build on the existing systems.
2. Build on the existing landscape character.
3. Integrate and mix users and activities.

The existing open space components on site are: the right-of-way, views opening to Mt. Rainier and the Cascades, the park system, and significant public facilities in the form of a school, community center, and police precinct. Pocket and central parks will be scattered throughout the area, and a trail system leading to the park developed. Adjacent activity areas will allow for simultaneous use by individual members of a family.

#### Community Facilities

David Rutherford

The community buildings will be located off the corner of 32<sup>nd</sup> and Myrtle St., an undesirable housing site that is a most desirable public site. Three buildings will occupy the site, a campus of learners, a family center/social community center, and a smaller management office. The principal entry level for both the campus of learners and the family center is the same, however the campus of learners has a level above the entry while the family center has a second level below.

#### Permitting, Review, Approval

Vince Lyons

Seventy-eight design guidelines were crafted by the joint review panel to reinforce the direction of the design team. DCLU is currently reviewing the subdivision application, a substantive SEPA conditioning, and a conditional use on the community buildings. Staff is coordinating with the Seattle Transportation Department on street vacations. A report is due to the Hearing Examiner on May 5th, with a hearing scheduled June 9th in coordination with the street vacation request to City Council. A decision by the hearing examiner is anticipated in mid June and the issuance of the Master Use Permit by the end of June.

#### Combined Design Review Panel

Dennis Haskell

The neighborhood design review board was brought into play on this project because of requested design departures. The Seattle Design Commission became involved because of the public nature of the project. The combined review panel met 6 times. At the last meeting, the combined review panel voted to approve right of way and access issues, lengths and widths of some venues, curb cut requirements, set back requirements, vista requirements, and paving materials. After working with the design team over a six month period, the plan was modified and refined based on many comments made. The seventy-eight guidelines outlined by the panel addressed the

master plan, the landscaping, unit design, requested departures, the development of a housing manual, covenants regarding scale and the addition of other architects. The current plan is a framework that provides for a certain level of flexibility.

### Housing Demographics

Doris Koo

There are currently approximately 870 families on-site at Holly Park. The population is predominantly very low income public housing tenants. 90% of the residents are people of color, a significant proportion are frail and elderly. 90% of the current population at Holly Park are non-citizen, new immigrants. Because of new Federal welfare laws, some of those on welfare will be cut off welfare as early as this summer. This fact creates an immediate need for new kinds of public housing and job readiness programs for a significant number of people.

In the initial planing of the redevelopment effort, the Seattle Housing Authority heard from the residents that they wanted to enjoy the land at Holly Park, but they did not want to be forced to live in a ghetto type situation. Residents were assured that the redeveloped site would create a mixed income neighborhood without internal segregation by location or quality of materials. Over the past three years, the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) has organized relocation counseling with the Holly Park population including two surveys and one choice counseling. The choice counseling consisted of public housing residents offering their peers the choice to return to Holly Park on the condition that a lease be signed agreeing to work (if able bodied and between the age of 18 and 55). Childcare and the services to be offered through the campus of learners were described. For those who did not want to return to Holly Park under those conditions, SHA secured 250 new section 8 vouchers. Other public housing was also offered. The choice counseling took 4 months to complete in 11 different languages. 427 families chose to return to Holly Park, while 253 chose section 8 vouchers (2/3 of which have moved out of Southeast Seattle). 11 families have bought homes with the vouchers. Remaining residents have chosen to go to other public housing facilities. The relocation activities began in September of 1996. Those who have chosen to stay in Holly Park will relocate on the site, so they will not have to break ties with existing schools, churches or the like. The time pressure of the Federal welfare reform has been a driver of the relocation schedule.

### Discussion

- Batra:** Regarding the site and orientation of the campus of learners, how will it be affected by noise pollution, particularly that generated by the nearby busy road?
- Rutherford:** The building has a southern orientation toward the sun and views.
- Popkin:** The library requested to be located in a highly visible location so as to draw the wider community. The library was a main driver for the campus of learners. Today the library is inside Holly Park and no one uses the facility except for Holly Park residents.
- Swift:** The courtyard is likely to be lower than the street. Sound coming from the tire wells of cars comes out at a 15° angle, and will thus not have a direct impact on the courtyard.

- Popkin:** In addition, a pedestrian signal will be put in at Myrtle and 32nd streets, which will help slow traffic down.
- Lewis:** The hill is relatively flat where we have realigned 32nd Street. The relocation of the street improves sight lines. We are focusing some of the Myrtle Street corridor street improvements on this particular intersection so as to provide a stronger safer link across the arterial.
- Dubrow:** How fixed is the requirement that no parking be provided in the City Light right of way? Frankly, I would hate to see that site become any more compressed.
- Rutherford:** We can use it for overflow parking, but not for the required number of parking spaces.
- Dubrow:** From the perspective of the Design Commission, I think it would be worth exploring to what degree it is in the City's interests to use the right of way for City Light parking.  
Regarding the interior circulation, how are you handling the transitions between different age users in a single facility?
- Swift:** We anticipate the greatest volume of users to be the day care clients. We will bring that group into the facility through the lowest grade entry at the eastern end of the building, so there is some initial separation that deals with potential user conflicts.
- Rutherford:** Typically the Southeast Asian population prefers to be closer to their children, rather than leave them in a separate building while attending classes. Throughout the design, the idea of trying to provide for kids and adults at the same time in the same building has been an important part of our thinking.
- Dubrow:** It seems worthwhile to develop a set of guidelines that are about how all aspects of this facility might integrate children in the detailing. Given your desire to integrate age groups, it would be prudent to accommodate children throughout the facility, not just on the child care areas. Those guidelines could in turn extend into the rest of the site.
- Foley:** Where are the outside play areas for the children in the child care?
- Rutherford:** There are fenced, controlled areas to the south and the west.
- Swift:** There is a desire for a children's garden in this area. In addition, the multi-purpose room opens out onto the courtyard.
- Batra:** Are you accommodating the current population in Holy Park phase 1 that will be displaced by phase 1?
- Weinstein:** I will turn to Henry Popkin to talk about demographics, however I can speak from a purely physical unit count point of view. There are 396 on-line units that are all public housing units right now. There will be 453 units composed of 305 rental units some of which are public housing, some of which are rental units. There are 148 for sale housing units.
- Popkin:** Of the 305 rental units 177 are public housing, in the first phase. The balance, except for 16, will be limited to those with an income level of up to 55% of median income. 16 will be market rate.
- Koo:** The combination of welfare reform and an over-aged housing stock has pushed us to find something new.

- Gonzalez:** We are looking at a social experiment that is rather overwhelming. One of my concern is how RTA and transit has been figured into the plan.
- Antupit:** We have already started part of phase 2 planning around RTA. A series of field trips and workshops have been planned in collaboration with the Planning Commission, the Neighborhood Planning Office, and people associated with this project exploring the implications and opportunities presented by a light rail station at MLK and Othello. We are working with RTA staff, the SHA redevelopment team and a wider community process to develop some guidelines about the station area. These guidelines will then serve both phase 2 design, the RTA in their environmental review and scoping exercise and Neighborhood Planning.
- Haskell:** One of the combined design review panel's guidelines calls for increased density around ML King Jr Way and Othello.
- Weinstein:** In addition, we have been discussing the possibility of a shuttle service from Holy Park down to ML King Jr. Way. We are accommodating the car, which is a necessity, however we are also concentrating on pedestrian amenities and transit links.
- Gonzalez:** I don't see the dynamics of the ethnic diversity reflected in your design, which is rather troubling.
- Weinstein:** It is a real challenge architecturally to reflect in physical form different cultures, especially because there needs to be a mechanism to accommodate a changing population over time where the demographic mix will shift. We resisted the temptation to have themes for the housing related to different cultures because those groups might not be part of the population in the future and we did not want to ghetto-ize specific parts of Holly Park. We have tried to design the housing so that it is flexible enough to adapt to a variety of populations. The open space system, including the p-patch does respond to the importance that a significant number of the current population places on gardening. In phase 3 we have proposed the possibility of a greenhouse.
- Dubrow:** I would agree with the previous comment. For fear of not recognizing the turnover and the diversity, you are pushed back to a position of neutrality in terms of any ethnic imprints on the site. I don't think it has to be an either/or position, but I would look to the glue - to the design of public spaces, to look for what range of cultural traditions and forms could be mirrored in and shape the design of that public landscape. I would urge you to look into this aspect a little more and not assume that it is up to the artist to resolve.
- Lyons:** One of the guidelines stated quite clearly that chain link fencing was to be avoided. To that end, a hierarchy of fencing needs to be developed including what we were just talking about, the ability of residents to own certain sides of the fencing.
- Haskell:** There is a whole series of guidelines that deal with diversity, without getting specific about the cultural response of any one house. The idea was to maximize choices and maximize imageability throughout the neighborhood based upon current and subsequent designs.

- Koo:** We are also working with the Seattle Arts Commission to explore the possibility of murals and/or artists in residence.
- Rutherford:** The Seattle Arts Commission has just selected a team to develop an art plan that involves the community in the process of identifying opportunities for art. We are dealing with 8 or 11 distinct cultural communities.
- Weinstock:** I think Holly Park presents a remarkable opportunity to learn some lessons about how we handle multi-family housing in general and how such projects move through the process. For instance, there are housing four other garden communities in Seattle that could greatly benefit from the successes at Holly Park. I hope we do not limit the flexibility or ability to streamline some of the processes to mega-projects.  
Regarding the housing types, are those that you presented today the same for both the rental and the for sale units?
- Weinstein:** The rental housing should look no different from the for sale housing. There are consistent depths and widths to the housing units as you can see in plan. There will be diversity in the for sale units. Essential characteristics are the same. There might be upgrades to the interior for the for sale housing.
- Weinstock:** Are you confident that what appears here in plan will be flexible enough to respond to the market?
- Weinstein:** The for sale units will be built out incrementally, rather than all at one time. We will be able to learn from the absorption of the housing what is marketable.
- Popkin:** One of the advantages the Housing Authority has is that it owns the land. It can be patient in its selling of the housing. We have 5 or 6 different products that we have developed in conjunction with a leading consultant in the home ownership market. A good absorption rate is expected. The site plan gives the prospective buyer confidence that they are buying into a community that looks like many others, rather than looking like a public housing project. In addition, no one in Seattle is building housing at this price.
- Weinstock:** Have we limited either by covenant or footprint the ability of the owner to make subsequent additions?
- Weinstein:** You would have the same challenges if you were to be in a single family neighborhood and want to do the same. Your only option is to go deep. There is the provision for an accessory unit above the garage that we are looking into.
- Dubrow:** What kinds of facilities will be available for incubator businesses?
- Weinstein:** Current zoning for phase 1 would have to be changed. After some thought we decided that phase 1 did not have the visibility from which an incubator business would greatly benefit. We are looking toward ML King Jr. Way as a location for such activities. In-home day care units are distributed across the site, mostly located at street ends and adjacent to open spaces.
- Rutherford:** Holly Park Enterprises is aggressively training residents in small business development.
- Fox:** The Design Commission has a copy of a letter that the Seattle Displacement Coalition, of which I am the coordinator, sent as well as a joint letter that was sent



to City Council outlining the concerns of several organizations and representatives from several groups. Our primary concern is not with the underlying goals of the project, but rather with the enormous cost of the project and the per unit cost that will consume an enormous amount of state and local resources that need to be conserved to produce add to the supply of very low income and low income units in Seattle and the region. At the end of the project, there will be an approximate net loss of 400 low income units. Our fear is that if this model is applied to the remainder of the Housing Authority's supply of housing, the City's low income housing supply will be decimated. We co-sponsored a forum at the University of Washington in cooperation with two professors with extensive experience in low income housing development. That forum was held two weeks ago and has been followed by a series of workshops where we have been trying to develop alternatives to this plan that would retain the underlying goals of the project but reduce the cost and produce the kind of savings that we can then redirect to generate and produce more very low income units to meet the commitment that came with this plan originally to guarantee no net loss to housing. We have asked for an opportunity to present our plan that is currently under development to the Design Commission to weigh as you evaluate the project.

**Sundberg:** As I understand, if the City Council asks the Design Commission to review the plan, we will indeed do so. We have had a long standing process of review of this project with members of the Design Commission participating in the Combined Design Review, and the full Commission following the project quite closely. We do work at the direction of City Council.

**Ousley:** Could you please discuss the use and consideration of alleys in the design?

**Weinstein:** Different portions of the site have integrated alleys as extensions of the street network from off-site. Our objective in imposing a street grid on the site was to extend the off site streets onto our site while responding to the topographic features. The net effect is that we do not have a consistent distribution of alleys. We have attempted to provide some housing on the alleys, which is an accepted practice in the city to increase density. Some Holly Park residents, however feel that the alley site is inferior and do not want to see public housing relegated to what they consider to be an inferior site. Until we can resolve these issues, we are considering the units on the alleys as place-holders. Alleys do provide the possibility over time of an in-home kind of job or craft where the garage could be utilized.

**Dubrow:** I wonder if it is possible to develop alleys not as independent units but rather as income generating units for a specific set of housing. It fits with your goals and while it does not add more density per se, it does add a layer of complexity in terms of the income generating opportunities.

**Hansmire:** Will the zoning allow you to do that?

**Weinstein:** We are looking at that. As it stands now, the unit would have to be attached.

**Hendrickson:** I have a market study on home ownership that came out in February. I am wondering how that study has impacted your project.

**Popkin:** We consulted with the report authors prior to the publication of the market study. You might have seen some proformas generated that show higher priced units. Those were done as financial studies about what it might take in the current market to break even. Our market rate housing consultant recommended that 10-15 % of the units be in the \$165,000 range and the bulk of the units be priced at \$140,000 or less.

**Hendrickson:** My question is really more about comments from the market study about orientation of the homes and multiple entries.

**Popkin:** A duplex lends itself to multiple entries.

**Weinstein:** The variety of orientations will allow individuals to select units based on personal preferences, be that feng-shui, solar orientation or the like. All units have logical provisions for two entries - that was an important consideration for defensibility. All units regardless of size have significant front porches and back porches.

**Haskell:** As the Design Commission representative of the combined design review panel, I would like to note that the design review panel was very supportive of this effort and would like to recommend that you give careful consideration of your support of the plan and process to date. As a solution to a very difficult problem that has often conflicting principles, this has been a very rational, very thoughtful, creative approach. While the housing does not solve all of our social issues and all of our housing problems, it is part of a new paradigm for the approach of providing housing for the public.

**ACTION:** The Seattle Design Commission strongly supports and recommends the further development of the current Holly Park redevelopment proposal as presented, particularly as it reflects an extensive process of community involvement that is unlikely to develop in alternatives that might be generated by others in the next two months. In addition, the Commission offers the following comments:

- The present solution addresses the situation by providing quality and adequacy in the housing stock. The approach and method represent a progressive agenda in terms of linking housing and social services in a manner that not only improves the daily life of residents, but also provides the support that may make it possible for people to move out, to move from renting to owning, or to make more significant financial contributions towards their rent. The high quality of the project warrants the potential difficulty to be encountered as a result of a loss of quantity.
- The issues of internal site circulation and hierarchy of landscape scale have been resolved. The next step is to knit those components back into the neighborhood including taking some of the landscape elements into surrounding neighborhoods to create strong transitions.
- The architecture is extraordinarily well conceived and thoughtful. With a few more refinements, it will offer the internal flexibility sought through the underlying goals of the project.

- **The idea of leaving traces of culture throughout the site, not necessarily in the physical architecture, but as part of the site, is conceptually strong and supported.**
- **Alley units linked to the rental units as well as peripheral development along the site for economic development are encouraged, and will hopefully help balance the function of the garage in the for-sale units versus the parking pads for the rental units.**
- **Careful and thoughtful programming of the community center is essential to developing meaningful support for the residents and a sense of community. The Commission requests to see the further development of the site plans and the organization of the internal functions for the community buildings when that level of information is complete.**
- **The development of design guidelines addressing the transitional spaces between different age and culture user groups in the two community facilities is strongly encouraged.**
- **The planning process has been very thoughtful in developing a new vision, and has broken down the historically accepted rules and methods for the design of public housing which have not been successful.**

**Finally, the Commission recognizes the project as a potential model for a more holistic approach to future development, if a mixed income community becomes the model for the redevelopment of low income housing. The Commission strongly urges City Council and the Seattle Housing Authority to continue to monitor the cumulative impacts of the reduction of units both on the public housing community and the larger community of Seattle.**

---

040397.2

**SEATTLE PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT**

Discussion

Diana Gale, Director

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Director Gale updated the Commission on the organization and responsibilities of the recently created Seattle Public Utilities Department. Functions of the former Water and Engineering Departments (excepting transportation functions) are now housed in the Public Utilities Department, providing an integrated Utility. The combined functions allow the Utility to provide a more integrated and efficient service to the public. A variety of specific projects were discussed, including the Reservoir Covering project.

**The Commission looks forward to meeting with project management and planning staff from the Public Utilities Department in June to develop ideas for a systemic approach to urban design issues within the Department.**



040397.3

**DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION**

Discussion

Patrick Doherty, Department of Construction and Land Use

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Commissioners and staff discussed the format of the report to be submitted to City Council regarding the Multifamily and Commercial Design Review process, as well as some suggested formats for the upcoming round table discussions with Design Review participants.

040397.4

**COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 1997 Approved as amended.
- B. MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 1997 Approved as amended.
- C. MUNICIPAL CENTER WORKING GROUP Wagoner updated the Commission on the continued work of the working group.
- D. LINCOLN RESERVOIR CONSULTANT SELECTION REPORT Batra reported.
- E. ENVIRONMENTAL LEARNING CENTER CONSULTANT SELECTION REPORT Foley reported.

040397.5

Project: **BOYER FUHRMAN STREET RECONSTRUCTION**

Phase: Design Development

Presenters: Ted Rees, Seattle Public Utilities

Shane Dewald, Seattle Transportation Department

Time: 1 hour (0.3%)

The purpose of the project is to calm traffic along Fuhrman and Boyer Avenues between Eastlake Avenue and East Lynn Street. The total cost of all desired improvements is \$3.8 million cost while the budget is \$1.2 million. For budgetary reasons, the project has been divided into phases although a concept is in development for the entire project. Curb bulbs, widening the street 2 feet in many areas to make it more compatible with bikes, medians, raised intersections, and traffic circles are the principle planned improvements. Initial work will take place on Fuhrman Avenue between Franklin and Allison streets and on Boyer Avenue between 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. E and the 520 bridge. Close partnering with the community has expanded the landscaping options, as community members will help with planting and maintenance. Sod or drought resistant ground

cover has been identified for the planting strip. Community representatives are currently looking for volunteers to adopt a planting area, such as a planting strip or traffic circle. Unfortunately, trees can only be planted on one side of the street due to the location of utilities. The design team is debating the character of the treatment.

### **Discussion**

- Foley:** Is there anywhere on that side of the right of way where trees can be planted, perhaps by pushing the pavement closer to the curb edge.
- Dewald:** The utilities come up right along side the back of where the sidewalk would be if we planted a full width planting strip.
- Swift:** I think of this street as starting at the University Bridge, going all the way over to the Arboretum and down to Lake Washington. It has a degree of diversity in vegetation that gives you the feeling of a place where people spend time with their fingers in the ground. Other streets around the City do not provide that same kind of experience. The experience one has along that road is an introduction to the Arboretum. I can imagine that the community members along that stretch are rather horticulturally intense - who given the opportunity would want on of everything. Looking at this as a corridor that has a unique character, based to some degree on a matrix of diversity, as opposed to a single species of trees. I wonder if you have that "big picture" level of discussion with community members, and what the big view of this corridor may be?
- Dewald:** In my past experience with Boyer, I have found views to be a concern of adjacent property owners, which prompted the use of shrub-like trees. In some areas people did not even want the smaller shrub-like tree, while further down the road others did not have any problem with existing sizable trees. I concur that there is a lot of variety along that stretch. Perhaps choosing a palette of groundcover as opposed to one specific species would be appropriate.
- Swift:** What are the principles, or what is the vision that is driving the design, other than the maintenance concerns?
- Dewald:** I keep going back to the traffic circle island which seems like an odd element to key off for a corridor treatment, however it does demonstrate a community's interest in a landscape that is unique. We decided to build upon that circle as the signature item for the corridor.
- Dubrow:** I appreciate what you each are saying. It seems like there is a need for visual continuity, and trying to achieve that through landscape elements makes sense. I wonder if maybe the palette is too narrow for trying to create a stronger sense of place. Maybe an overhead trellis on the side of the street that cannot support trees - something the community can be involved in building and maintaining - can move you in the direction you are trying to go.
- Swift:** It is possible to do what each individual neighborhood wants - to an extent. There should, however, be a comprehensive quality - whether it is uniformity or chaos.
- Layzer:** From a practical standpoint the chaos will emerge over time. People will add their own touches. Maybe that does suggest for this effort a more uniform approach.

- Rees:** Perhaps the project could provide the underlying uniform layer onto which people added their own personal touches, giving each section a certain unique quality.
- Dubrow:** As you go to more community meetings, I think you have a great opportunity to show through graphic devices what the city can provide, and what community members can add through volunteer labor, and grant sources.
- Foley:** I think the effort you have made to be in contact with the residents is wonderful.
- Rees:** It is good to keep in mind that the planting strip and sidewalk are the responsibility of the property owner. It is in our best interests to design that area such that the property owners will want to maintain it.
- Darwish:** Will the traffic circle have a tree in the middle?
- Dewald:** Yes.
- Darwish:** I find those hard to see around. Does anyone else agree?
- Swift:** I don't like them when they are young, but I really like the trees once they are mature. They are, however, very effective in slowing traffic down.
- Read:** How are the needs of cyclists being addressed in this corridor?
- Dewald:** It my understanding that the intent of this project is to control vehicular traffic in an effective enough manner so that bicycle traffic is compatible with vehicular traffic as opposed to trying to create a separate bike lane for cyclists.
- Dubrow:** I hope you have taken a close look at those areas where you have bulbed the curb, I would want the bulbs to work as well for the bicycles as for the cars.

**ACTION:** **The Commission recommends approval of the project, commending the planning process that anticipates future development as well as involving the community in the planning as well as implementation of the design.**

---

040397.6      Project: **MAGNOLIA POOL**  
                 Phase: Schematics  
                 Presenters: Don Bullard, Department of Parks and Recreation  
                                 Dave Miller, Miller|Hull Partnership  
                                 Steve Tatge, Miller|Hull Partnership  
                                 Tony Steward, Citizens Advisory Board  
                 Time: 1 hour (0.3%)

Through Metro mitigation funds, the Magnolia community founded a private non-profit group to start working on a public private partnership to design and build a community pool. Last year the city Law Department determined that the public private design build partnership was not legal. The project was turned over to the Park Department in December of 1996. The schedule is very tight, with ground breaking scheduled for August of this year. The funding source is limited with no opportunities for the contribution of additional City funds.

Two design options were proposed to the advisory committee - a one building scheme and a two building scheme. The two building scheme was preferred and developed. Parking and the street will be screened from the pool with the buildings, while the site will open up to the adjacent park and ball fields. The landscaping will be tied into the park, while the single pitch shed buildings pick up on the nearby school buildings. As the pool will only be open during the summer months, circulation and waiting areas can be accommodated out doors. The two buildings will be connected by a glazed trellis arcade. Although there is the possibility of enclosing the facility in the future the budget does not allow for utilities to be sized to service an enclosed pool. Mirror image locker rooms will sit to the east of the lap pool, with one family changing rooms in between the locker rooms. The staff and service building will sit to the north of the pool, housing the cashier function, pool equipment storage and mechanics. The 5 lane lap pool with pull-out recreational area will be complemented by a smaller training pool.

### **Discussion**

- Batra:** I do not understand the shape of the training pool, it looks like a boxing glove to me.
- Tatge:** It will probably not be that shape. We have been given instructions to make it a fun shape. Given the function of the pool, we will try and create eddies so that a few small groups of children can be accommodated at the same time.
- Batra:** I am concerned about the single entry and exit. Should there be a chlorine gas leak, will people be able to exit the area quickly enough?
- Tatge:** That has come up as an issue. There are a number of spots that we can introduce another exit, but we also need to be mindful that any additional exits will have to be monitored.
- Darwish:** Is the deck area slip resistant?
- Tatge:** The program calls for a light groom finish in the concrete, we will probably use a medium groove finish.
- Darwish:** What is the height of the slide and what depth will it propel people to?
- Tatge:** Right now the depth of the pool where the slide comes in is 5 feet. If the pool ends up being nine feet deep, the slide entry point will probably be 7 feet. If the pool ends up being 5 feet deep, the slide entry point will probably be 4.5 feet. The slide itself is about 15 feet high. Either way, the slide will be designed such that entry into the water will be safe.
- Foley:** Is there space on the street where people can pull off to the side, or do people have to pull into the parking lot to drop others off?
- Tatge:** There is parking allowed on the street, drop off could work from the street or from the parking. We could make some of the parking places closer to the lobby 15 minute load unload.
- Dubrow:** I really don't have enough information to judge what is driving some of the decisions about the design, but it seems to me it might be desirable to have an entry that is more compact and identifiable. If the two buildings were brought closer together, that would make the entry more compact. I wonder about the need for a



closed room for the pool equipment storage, as the facility will be locked. Also, is there a way to create more of a connection between the training pool and the lap pool.

**Tatge:** We have been moving the two buildings around on the site and experimenting with different locations. There is a desire for people to be able to see in to the pool area. The pool needs to generate its own revenue and needs to sell itself. We can work on making the entry more clear, while maintaining the generous space.

**Dubrow:** Maybe you could conceive of the entry a little differently. Providing the public access to the locker rooms and rest rooms would give people an opportunity to preview the facility.

**Tatge:** I think your point of making the entry more identifiable while providing visual access to the facility is good.

**Swift:** I have the sense that you are grappling with a very tight budget. Are there elements that you think you might have to let go or are there elements that you have already had to let go that in your opinion, will compromise the long term viability of the project?

**Tatge:** I don't think there are any fatal flaws. We started with a heated facility, which we eventually gave up. The program areas are still all there, except that we only have one family changing room instead of two. The depth of the pool is a policy decision at this point.

**Miller:** There has been some talk about taking out the connecting breezeway. I think losing that would be a real disappointment. To me that is the idea behind this scheme, two buildings connected by a covered public space. If that were to happen, I think we would have to reconsider a single building. I think masonry would have been better, but I think the Hardy Board will work. It is important, however, to remember that the buildings are only one third of the cost.

**Hansmire:** I would encourage you to hang on to that trellis that and covered connection as strongly as you can. Not only does it work into the entry, but it is the only protected area around the pool that people can get out of the rain during those summer showers.

**Foley:** It may be possible for the lawn area to the south to be incorporated within the fence.

**Dubrow:** If you were to pull the buildings closer together to create the sense of entry, it might allow you to pull that arcade inside into the pool. That would not be the only area to reach out.

**Swift:** When you look at the model and you look at the scale and mass of the building by pulling the two buildings apart and wrapping that structure around in a light but strong way it defines that corner.

**Foley:** Thank you for a very clear presentation. The model has been so helpful.

**Darwish:** I would discourage additional gates, given the number of children. A single entry makes it easier for parents and others to monitor children

**ACTION: The Commission recommends approval of the project and appreciates the thoughtful approach taken that resulted in a simple, functional solution on a very tight budget.**